



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,341	01/13/2004	Mohammed N. Islam	074036.0132	3483
5073	7590	08/17/2006	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.			HELLNER, MARK	
2001 ROSS AVENUE			ART UNIT	
SUITE 600			PAPER NUMBER	
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			3663	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/757,341	ISLAM, MOHAMMED N.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark Hellner	3663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-41 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 42-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/13/2004</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because they are informal hand sketches. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it does not presently describe the embodiment being claimed. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Art Unit: 3663

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 42-44, 46-48, 54-56, 58, 62 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Esterowitz et al.

Esterowitz et al discloses an infra-red light source comprising a ZBLAN waveguide.

ZBLAN is a material capable of Stimulated Brilluin Scattering and, as such, is readable as a Raman shifter.

The structure above teaches claim 42.

Claims 43 and 44 are taught by the 2.7 micron operating wavelength set forth by the abstract.

Claim 46 is taught by element (15).

Claims 47 and 48 are taught by elements (21) and (23).

Claims 54-56 are taught by element (13).

Claim 58 is taught by column 1, line 22.

Claims 62 and 63 are taught by column 2, line 26.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 57 and 59-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Esterowitz et al.

The modification of Esterowitz et al that would meet claims 59-61 is the addition of a fiber optic waveguide to the output of the disclosed device.

Column I, line 22 of Esterowitz teaches that the device be used in medical applications and, as such, motivates the coupling of fiber optics to its output in order to facilitate reaching locations on a body.

Claim 57 would have been met by a Raman amplifier used as the pumping light source (13).

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Esterowitz et al in view of Tabirian et al.

Tabirian et al teach that wavelengths in the range of 1.4 to 3.9 microns were desirable in the IR band.

It would have been obvious to have modified the Esterowitz et al device to these wavelengths when seeking more communication bandwidth.

Claims 49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Esterowitz et al in view of Bufetov et al.

Art Unit: 3663

Bufetov et al teaches that grating were a known alternative to mirrors as cavity defining elements fro amplifying fibers.

Claims 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Esterowitz et al and Bufetov et al as applied to claims 49 and 50 above, and further in view of Fermann et al.

Ferman et al is cited to demonstrate that pulse amplification was a known alternative to the CW amplification disclosed by Esterowitz et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark Hellner at telephone number 571 272 6981.

Mark Hellner

Primary Examiner

AU 3663

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mark Hellner". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.